Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2015-2016   **Due:** June 1, 2016

Program: Homeland Security Studies (certificate)   **Date:** May 10, 2016

Completed by: Steven Liebel, PhD (Program Director)

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment):
_____

Please complete this form for each undergraduate, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, and submit it to the dean of your college/school as per the deadline established. The dean will forward it to me as an email attachment before June 2, 2016. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at http://www.csupueblo.edu/Assessment/ResultsAndReports/Pages/default.aspx.

Please describe the 2015-2016 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2016-2017 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2015-2016 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2014-2015. Thank you.

I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? **Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.**	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? **Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.**	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of students should be at it?	F. What were the results of the assessment?	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the program are planned based on this assessment?

| 1. Communication
2. Writing

From the SLO statement:
Communication:
"Students will be able to construct, compose, and deliver professional reports, research, and briefings."

Writing:
"Students will be able to construct coherent, objective, and well reasoned arguments pertaining to topics on homeland security." | Spring 2015 | Communication:

The program director observed and evaluated in-class presentations of student research on terrorist organizations. Evaluations were performed taking into account feedback students were provided prior to presentations on content, technique, attire, and presentation materials.

See communication rubric attached at end of document.

Writing:

The program director used a common rubric to evaluate papers from the Terrorism class.

See writing rubric attached at end of document. | 15 students from the Spring term 200 level Terrorism course were sampled. 18 students constitutes every student in the course, but two students withdrew before writing assignments were submitted and presentations were performed, one student took an incomplete. | As per the programs assessment plan, 80% of students should perform at or above "proficient" for each SLO. With 15 students in the assessment pool, 12 should achieve at or above proficiency. | 14 of 15 students met the expectation of proficiency for communication, and 12 of 15 met the expectation of proficiency for writing. | Communication:

Strengths – Students displayed a knowledge of theoretical causes, underlying conditions, and organizational concerns. Students dressed appropriately for a professional style presentation. Finally, students displayed clear communication skills in post-presentation question session.

Weaknesses – Students displayed a weakness in extrapolating from past and current behavior to future expectations.

Writing:

Strengths – As in prior years, again students display an ability to amass significant volumes of relevant evidence based research and distill it to critical points/facts. They also display an ability to do quality background research. The majority of papers were quite | The 2015-16 year assessment indicates strength in communication and signs of border-line strength/weakness in writing.

Student presentations were professional and scored highly. They were well organized, were responsive to instructor feedback, and addressed required areas. Student dress was significantly improved given changes made according to last years self-assessment. Areas of growth for the future include increased time spent on ways to extrapolate from past behavior onto the future.

Student writing remains a challenge for some students. Papers are submitted in multiple stages throughout the semester with feedback following each stage. However, research papers that scored below proficient tended to fall below guidelines stated in the syllabus, or ignored them entirely. This should have added emphasis in the future. |
| | | | | | | | |

						strong. Weaknesses – Again as in previous years, several student papers were significantly weaker that their peers, The vast majority of papers were strong. Those that were not failed on a broad number of issues including: depth of research, structure, and following the basic expectations of the syllabus. This would indicate a bimodal distribution within the classes writing. Many students "got it" from the syllabus and instruction, a few did not or chose not to follow instructions.	

Comments:

Communication:

To meet the expectation of 80% proficiency, 12 of 15 students must attain said level. Upon assessing all students according to the same communication rubric, 14 achieved proficiency. This is at the necessary level. Contributing to this level are several circumstances that emerged from one student. One students failed to achieve proficiency in "delivery" given inappropriate attire/pace/voice volume, reading off of their notes, and re-starting the presentation after progressing several minutes in.

Student presentations are a necessary component of the students semester grade, accounting for 10% of said grade. This fact is made clear on introduction of the syllabus and throughout the semester. Throughout the semester there are numerous times where we discuss proper instruction technique, especially in reference to this presentation. However, this is not a class on public speaking. We do not do multiple presentations throughout the term. As a result, we are unable to assist students who might be nervous prior to speaking. This is, in my judgement, what occurred with the single student who did not meet expectations this year. 14 of 15 students succeeded, and we will continue to work with the entire class to prepare them to present professionally.

Writing:

To meet the expectation of 80% proficiency, 12 of 15 students must attain said level. Upon assessing all students according to the same writing rubric, 12 achieved proficiency. This is at the necessary level. Contributing to this level are several circumstances: two students did not do in-depth research to the level required in the syllabus or instructor feedback, one student did not write clearly.

There are remedies to these issues that can be applied in class. There should be additional emphasis placed on depth of research and clarity of writing. In order to facilitate this, there should be more time spent addressing what this looks like and how to do it. On the former, the class reads professional level research throughout the term. It should be reinforced that this is what we are looking for. Not that students should do research at that level, but use it as an example on which to structure their thoughts.   For the former, students are briefed every semester in the library on how to perform professional academic research. I will consider making an anonymous exemplary paper from a previous term available to them so as to see what can and should be performed.

II. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) did you address? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?

1. Communication 2. Writing From the SLO statement: Communication: "Students will be able to construct, compose, and deliver professional reports, research, and briefings." Writing: "Students will be able to construct coherent, objective, and well reasoned arguments pertaining to topics on homeland security."	Spring 2015	Recommendations were to increase emphasis on structure in writing related feedback. In particular, this was to take place in early semester feedback.	Yes, this recommendation was acted upon.	All students are – and have been since 2012 – required to submit a paper in multiple stages throughout the semester. This gives the professor increased opportunity to monitor student writing progress over the course of the term. What was new in this process for 2015-16 was the emphasis on structure. There were no issues within students writing related to structure outside of the normal. We thus accomplished a goal of assisting with organizational principles.

Comments:

Communication:

Students excelled in this area. They were dressed well, spoke clearly, and were professional in incorporating feedback and responding to questions in question and answer sessions. Because only one student was faced with issues in the current assessment cycle, the current approach will be continued so as to maintain this level of competency.

Writing:

The issue that has presented itself within writing is no longer what it was in 2014-15. In earlier assessment periods, issues with writing were related to structure. This has largely be rectified through increased class time focusing on how to structure a paper, as well as feedback individualized for each student that spends time discussion how a paper should be structured. This feedback comes to students early in the term after they submit a research proposal, so they have a consistent idea of what a paper should look like moving forward in the term.

Homeland Security Studies Certificate
Colorado State University--Pueblo
Writing Rubric

Intended student learning outcome assessed with this rubric:
- *Students will be able to construct coherent, objective, and well reasoned arguments pertaining to topics on homeland security.*

Student work assessed:
- Research paper

Critical Thinking	Exemplary:	Proficient:	Emerging:	Not Present:
A. Application of Evidence, Concepts, Theories	Evidence, concepts, and theories, incorporated are *relevant*, and *clearly* articulated	Evidence, concepts, and theories are incorporated	Evidence, concepts, and theories are incorporated on a *limited* basis, and are only *occasionally* relevant	
B. Quality of Reasoning	Connections drawn between evidence, concepts, theories, and conclusions are *clearly* explained and *fully* evaluated	Connections drawn between evidence, concepts, theories, and conclusions are explained and evaluated	Connections drawn between evidence, concepts, theories, and conclusions are *occasionally* explained and evaluated, potentially incorrectly	
C. Exposition and style	Document is *well* organized, *clearly* structured, and *free* of spelling and grammatical errors. Organization *contributes* to readability.	Document organization is *coherent,* with occasional spelling and grammatical errors. Organization neither contributes nor detracts from readability.	Document organization is *opaque* with frequent spelling and grammatical issues. Organization detracts from readability.	

Homeland Security Studies Certificate
Colorado State University--Pueblo
Communication Rubric

Intended student learning outcome assessed with this rubric:
- *Students will be able to construct, compose, and deliver professional reports, research, and briefings.*

Student work assessed:
- Research presentation/briefing

Communication	Exemplary:	Proficient:	Emerging:	Not Present:
A. Delivery	Delivery is *dynamic*, utilizing *varied* tone, volume, pace, and body language in support of argument(s). Attire *enhances* environment.	Delivery is *clear,* utilizing *appropriate* tone, volume, pace, and body language in support of argument(s). Attire *supports* environment.	Delivery is audible, utilizing *flat* or *non-varied* tone, volume, pace, and body language in support of argument(s). Attire *detracts* from environment.	
B. Presentation Tools	Presentation tools are *logical,* utilizing *clear* sequences and transitions. Visual aids are *error-free* and *enhance* presentation environment.	Presentation tools are *mostly logical* and *generally* utilize clear sequences and transitions. Visual aids are *generally error-free* and *support* the presentation environment.	Presentation tools are *occasionally logical* and may utilize *confusing* sequences and transitions. Visual aids are *error-prone* and *detract* from the presentation environment.	
C. Question and Answer Period	Provides a *thorough* justification of conclusions, *clearly* explains rationales and assumptions.	Provides a justification of conclusions, explains rationales and assumptions.	Conclusions are not clearly justified, and/or assumptions are not explained.	